

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA  
AT BLUEFIELD

CECIL RAY ALDRIDGE,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:18-00596

BARBARA RICKARD, Warden,

Respondent.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

By Standing Order, this action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Dwane L. Tinsley for submission of findings and recommendation regarding disposition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) (1) (B). Magistrate Judge Tinsley submitted to the court his Findings and Recommendation on August 2, 2019, in which he recommended that the court grant respondent's Motion to Dismiss, deny respondent's Motion to Transfer, deny petitioner's motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, and remove this case from the court's active docket.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), petitioner was allotted fourteen days and three mailing days in which to file any objections to Magistrate Judge Tinsley's Findings and Recommendation. The failure of any party to file such objections within the time allowed constitutes a waiver of

such party's right to a de novo review by this court. Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363 (4th Cir. 1989).

Neither party filed any objections to the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation within the requisite time period. Accordingly, the court adopts the Findings and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Tinsley as follows:

1. Respondent's Motion to Dismiss is **GRANTED**;
2. Respondent's Motion to Transfer is **DENIED**;
3. Petitioner's motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 is **DENIED**;
4. This action is **DISMISSED**; and
5. The Clerk is directed to remove this case from the court's active docket.

Additionally, the court has considered whether to grant a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). A certificate will not be granted unless there is "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The standard is satisfied only upon a showing that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by this court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling is likewise debatable.

Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). The court concludes that the governing

standard is not satisfied in this instance. Accordingly, the court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability.

The Clerk is further directed to forward a copy of this Memorandum Opinion and Order to counsel of record.

**IT IS SO ORDERED** this 11th day of September, 2019.

ENTER:

David A. Faber

David A. Faber  
Senior United States District Judge